REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested. This communication is being filed in response to the Office Action having a mailing date of July 13, 2007. Various claims are amended as shown, and claims 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, 19 and 23 are canceled in this response without prejudice. With this amendment, claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-8, 10-11, 13-14, 16-18, 20-22 and 24 are pending in the application.

I. Preliminary Comments

The present Office Action objected to the abstract and to the disclosure. The abstract and specification are amended as shown to address these objections.

The present Office Action objected to claims 1 and 3. Claim 1 is amended to address the objection, and claim 3 is canceled herein without prejudice, thereby rendering the objection moot.

Accordingly, it is kindly requested that the objections be withdrawn.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 3-4, 6-7, 9-10, 12-13, 15-16, 19-20 and 23-24 would be in condition for allowance if rewritten in independent form. All of the indicated claims that are pending, however, depend from independent claim 1, which is allowable for the reasons stated below. Accordingly, claims 4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 20 and 24 are in condition for allowance.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 11, 14, 17, 18, 21, and 22 as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,607,690 to Anahara et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,245,171 to Natarajan et al.. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. As indicated in the comments below, Anahara et al. and Natarajan et al. fail to disclose or suggest every element as set forth in independent claim 1, from which all other rejected claims are dependent.

Claim 1 recites "positioning a multi-layered unit formed on a support sheet, wherein the multi-layered unit includes a release layer, an electrode layer and a ceramic green

sheet, so that a surface of the multi-layered unit is located on a base substrate; pressing the multi-layered unit toward the base substrate; and laminating the multi-layered unit on the base substrate." Therefore, an embodiment corresponding to claim 1 contemplates the use of both a support sheet (4) and a base substrate (28). See Karatsu et al., Fig. 9. Anahara et al. and Natarajan et al. fail to teach or suggest the use of these distinct elements of both a support sheet and a base substrate, and thus fail to teach the "positioning a multi-layered unit formed on a support sheet ... so that a surface of the multi-layered unit is located on a base substrate" as set forth in claim 1.

The Office Action asserts that Anahara et al. disclose the steps of "positioning a multi-layered unit (1a) so that the surface of the multi-layered unit is located on a base substrate (see Col. 6, lines 38), and pressing the multi-layered unit toward the base substrate and laminating the multi-layered unit on the base substrate (see Col. 7, lines 13-20)." This assertion by the present Office Action is respectfully traversed.

Specifically, Anahara et al. at col. 6, line 38 disclose the use of a support sheet to form an electrode-carrying sheet (11). Anahara et al. disclose in column 6, lines 40-67 that a ceramic green sheet is fabricated by forming a release layer on the support sheet to form a carrier film and applying a ceramic slurry onto the carrier film. Then, Anahara et al. disclose in column 7, lines 4-20 that an unfired laminate 1a is fabricated by screen printing a Ni paste on the thus fabricated ceramic green sheet so as to fabricate an electrode carrying sheet 11 having printed inner electrodes, and then laminating predetermined piles of electrode-carrying sheet 11 and ceramic green sheets (outermost layer sheets) 21 having no electrode, and compressing on both upper and lower sides of the laminate.

Thus, it can be ascertained from the above that Anahara et al. only laminates a multi-layered unit on a support sheet, and does not further perform "laminating the multi-layered unit on the base substrate" as recited in claim 1. In particular, Anahara et al. fails to teach the subsequent positioning of the electrode-carrying sheet (11) formed on the support sheet so that a surface of the electrode-carrying sheet (11) is located on a base substrate. Anahara et al., Fig. 2. As stated above, an embodiment corresponding to claim 1 contemplates the presence of both a support sheet (4) and a base substrate (28) as distinct elements. Karatsu et al., Fig. 9. Anahara et

al. discloses only the support sheet and thus fails to disclose or suggest every element as set forth in independent claim 1, such as the multi-layer unit formed on the support sheet and positioned/located on the base substrate.

Furthermore and with respect to col. 7, lines 13-20, Anahara et al. disclose generally a process of laminating a series of electrode-carrying sheets (11) and ceramic green sheets (21), but fail to disclose or suggest the use of a base substrate, pressing toward the base substrate, or laminating on the base substrate. See Anahara et al., Fig. 2. As such, Anahara et al. fail to disclose or suggest every element as set forth in claim 1.

Hence, claim 1 is allowable over Anahara.

Turning to Natarajan et al., the present Office Action asserts that Natarajan et al. "teach the multi-layered unit (30) formed on a support sheet (31) and an agglutinant layer (33) is formed on the base sheet (bottom layer 31, Fig. 3) for laminating the multilayer unit and separating it from the base sheet without damaging the multilayer unit (see Col. 7, lines 47-51)." However, contrary to the Office Action's assertion, Natarajan does not teach the use of a multi-layered unit formed on a support sheet, wherein the multi-layered unit includes a release layer, an electrode layer and a ceramic green sheet. Rather, Natarajan et al. disclose the use of two lamination plates (31) having sufficient rigidity to bond a thin green sheet to a thick green sheet by compressing the thick and thin sheets between the lamination plates (31) to form a multi-density structure (30). See Natarajan et al., Fig. 3. The multi-density structure (30) of Natajaran does not teach or suggest the multi-layered unit of claim 1 because Natajaran's multi-density structure (30) does not contain a release layer and was not formed on a support sheet. Again, an embodiment corresponding to claim 1 contemplates both a support sheet (4) and a base substrate (28) as distinct elements. Karatsu et al., Fig. 9. The Office Action in contrast improperly cites item 31 of Natarajan et al. as both a support sheet and a base substrate. Accordingly, independent claim 1 and all dependent claims which are dependent from claim 1, are allowable over Anahara et al. in view of Natarajan et al..

With respect to claim 2, Natarajan et al. does not teach or suggest the use of an agglutinant layer. In contrast, Natarajan et al. disclose the use of an inorganic adhesion barrier dust (33) to prevent adhesion between the laminating plates (31) and the multi-density structure

(30). See Natarajan et al. Specification, col. 5, lines 55-58 and col. 7, lines 32-35. The agglutinant layer (27) of an embodiment corresponding to claim 2 operates to bond the base substrate (28) to the green sheet (2) of the multi-layered unit (20). See Karatsu et al., Fig. 9. Therefore, the adhesion barrier (33) in Natarajan et al. cannot be characterized as an agglutinant layer as defined in claim 2. Accordingly, claim 2 and all dependent claims which are dependent from claim 2, are allowable over Anahara et al. in view of Natarajan et al.

IV. Other Claim Discussion

Various amendments are made to the claims as shown to provide consistent antecedent basis, to make typographical/grammatical corrections, and/or to otherwise place such claims in better form. Moreover, claim 1 is amended to clarify that the various elements recited therein do not fall within the scope of 35 U.S.C. § 112, sixth paragraph.

V. Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims remaining in the application are allowable. Favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

The Director is authorized to charge any additional fees due by way of this Amendment, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090.

Respectfully submitted,

SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC

Jared Barrett
Registration No. 57,933

JMB:ljs

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5400
Seattle, Washington 98104
Phone: (206) 622-4900
Fax: (206) 682-6031

993826_1.DOC